DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 298 HE 025 083

AUTHOR Carroll, James B.
TITLE A Typology of Career Movements of Department Chairs: Identifying Academic Leadership. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 91
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; *Career Development; College Faculty; *Department Heads; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Leadership; *Sex Differences; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Biglan Model

ABSTRACT

This study examined the career behaviors of department chairs in higher education and investigated possible context variables which may correlate with specific identified patterns of career movement. A total of 808 department chairs from 101 institutions were sent a questionnaire survey. The participants were distributed over eight Biglan model categories of academic discipline. The gender variable highlighted differences among chairs: (1) 1 in 10 chairs were female; (2) men were full professor for longer than women before becoming chair; and (3) females, more than males, expressed interest in administrative positions. When comparing department chairs from "hard" and "soft" disciplines, the data showed that soft discipline chairs were older than hard discipline chairs. In addition, tenure in the position of chair was longer in the hard disciplines than the soft. Hard discipline chairs were less likely to return to full time faculty after their tenure was up. Career paths before achieving department chair showed considerable variation with some general tendencies along the hard/soft and male/female variables. In addition, the chair is generally seen not as a career move toward another goal but as a brief period of service to the department and institution. Included are 2 tables and 39 references. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED339298

# A Typology of Career Movements of Department Chairs: Identifying Academic Leadership

James B. Carroll
Washington State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of
Association for the Study of Higher Education
Boston, Massachusetts
October 31, 1991

HE 025 083

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James B. Carroll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

# A Typology of Career Movements of Department Chairs: Identifying Academic Leadership

The academic department chair may be the most important functionary in institutions of higher learning. Estimates are that up to 80 percent of all administrative decisions made in colleges and universities are made by department chairs (Heimler, 1967; Roach, 1976). Department chairs have the power and responsibility to influence institutional policies and procedures; recommend faculty for appointment, promotion, and tenure; control budgets, class and teaching schedules; affect student interactions with the institution; and establish or maintain a departmental culture (Dressel, Johnson & Marcus, 1970; Heimler, 1967; Tucker, 1984). They are leaders in establishing departmental goals and objectives. They are the predominant representative of their faculties to the rest of the institution, selected professional organizations, and client groups out side of the college or university.

The focus of much of the previous research on the position of the department chair (McLaughlin, Montgomery & Malpass, 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976) has been understanding the role of department chair and the institutions in which it occurs. With the importance of the chair position to higher education there is a need to understand the people who become department chairs and to assist them in being more effective leaders. Initially, in this pursuit, it is important to find a strategy that can assist in the assessment of the relationship of chairs to the institutions in which they work.

In 1959, Erving Goffman (Goffman, 1961) wrote about moral careers as the regular sequence of changes in *self* that occur as part of an individual's interaction with a significant society. He elaborates on this interaction:

> Each moral career, and behind this, each self, occurs within the confines of an institutional system. . . . The self, then, can be seen as something that resides in the arrangements prevailing in a social system for its members. The self in this sense is not the property of the person to whom it is attributed, but dwells rather in the *pattern of social control that is exerted in connection with the person* by himself and those around him. (p.168) [italics added]

This perspective in relation to department chairs suggests that much can be known about the individuals who reside in the position of chair by understanding the pattern of movement within the social system in which the position, and those who occupy it, reside. These patterns of movement are what are traditionally referred to as *careers*.

The study of careers provides insights into abstract goals of the organization, programmatic goals of sub-units within organizations, and goals of the individuals who act within the sub-units within the organization (Blankenship, 1977). The study of careers establishes a platform from which to observe both the character of the individuals within an organization and their relationship to the institutions in which they work.

Wilensky (1968) defines careers as "a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in a ordered, predictable sequence" (p.50). In a traditional business hierarchy managers make one of three career moves at each career stage: advancement to a hierarchically higher position, movement to a different department at the same hierarchical level, or movement to a position of greater centrality within a department at the same hierarchical level (Schein, 1977). This consistency of upward or inward movement makes it possible to examine the careers of top administrators and extrapolate to the careers of all administrators within a given hierarchy.

In various studies of the path to the presidency of institutions of higher learning (Cohen & March, 1986; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier & Bragg, 1983; Twombly, 1986a), a normative career path of faculty, department chair, dean, provost, and presidency appears. The position of department chair is the most common entry point into the hierarchy of academic administration. In addition, the vast majority of department chairs come from faculty ranks. The picture the latter two statements form is one of the position of department chair as a transitional stage between faculty and administration in higher education.

Anecdotal evidence (Booth, 1982; Tucker, 1984) suggests that this top down point of view (defining the careers of all members of a hierarchy from the movements of those on

the top of the hierarchy) may not work within academic institutions. For instance, the majority of academic administrators have never been department chairs. Either some mitigating variables are necessary to explain anomalous career behaviors at specific hierarchical levels (Cohen & March, 1986; Twombly, 1986b) or the natures of academic institutions may not lend themselves to traditional business models of career paths.

If career studies are to benefit the understanding of specific positions within academic administration, then the studies must be of the people at those positions and not extrapolations from information about individuals at other levels. This study is designed to examine the career behaviors of one level of academic administration—the department chair— and to investigate possible context variables which may correlate with specific identified patterns of career movement of those individuals.

Finally, although the primary goals of this study involve gathering of empirical data, the motivation for this search is to improve the lot of department chairs. John Gardner (1990) states, "most of the capabilities that enable an outstanding leader to lead are learned" (p. 157). Improving leadership at the department level requires focusing on systems of leadership development. All of those systems (Booth, 1982; Creswell, Seagren & Henry, 1979; McDade, 1987; Shtogren, 1978; Tucker, 1984) indicate the need for baseline data on the demographics and career patterns of department chairs.

The following sections describe the study and some of the data gathered. The paper ends with an examination of how these data illuminate the problems of academic leadership at the department level.

## Method

Department chairs in 101 Carnegie Council "Research I and II," and "Doctorate Granting I and II" institutions (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1987) were surveyed concerning their career movements and the movements of their two predecessors. Various studies (Creswell & Bean, 1981; McLaughlin, et al., 1975; Smart & Elton, 1976)

have suggested that responses would vary dependent on the discipline of the respondents. In this study the Biglan (1973) model for classifying disciplines is used. Biglan clusters academic departments into eight cells based on tri-dimensional comparisons of characteristics of the subject matter of the discipline. One dimension is a determination of the degree to which a discipline has a developed paradigm—hard versus soft. Other dimensions are pure versus applied, and life versus non-life systems. The resulting classification names each discipline in terms of these variables (history is a soft, pure, life discipline; mechanical engineering is a hard, applied, non-life discipline). Creswell and Roskens (1981) demonstrate the veracity of the Biglan model.

A questionnaire was sent to a chair within each Biglan cell at each of the sample institutions, for a total sample of 808 department chairs. Five hundred and sixty-four questionnaires (70.2%) were returned. The variables addressed by the questionnaire included: department size; chair's age, gender; characteristics of the current chair's career; the nature of departmental hiring practices; whether chairs have had previous administrative experience; the length of tenure of the two previous chairs in each department, and a description of the movement those chairs made from the chair position.

This study was designed to gather information from chairs across a number of institutions. Because it is difficult to place all departments accurately into the Biglan model (Muffo & Langston, 1981), only departments where there was a high probability of correct placement into the model were used. To compensate for the possibility that specific disciplines may, to some degree, misrepresent the tendencies of all disciplines in a specific Biglan cell, the analysis in this study will only examine Biglan dichotomies. Hard/soft, pure/applied, and life/nonlife comparisons address the fundamental differences among departments that Biglan and others have found (Creswell & Bean, 1981). This strategy has been used by various authors (Creswell & Bean, 1981; Creswell, et al., 1979; Smart & Elton, 1975). By focusing on the Biglan dichotomies, instead of the individual cells within

the model, differences among departments still can be observed, and the probability that any one set of departments will confuse the data is reduced.

## Results

Although a full listing of the results of this study are described elsewhere (Carroll, in press) two variables within this study—gender and discipline paradigm development (Biglan's hard/soft categories)—were able to highlight differences among chairs over a number of measures.

### Gender

Approximately 1 in 10 chairs is female (9.52%) and this was not significantly different among discipline groupings. The differences in relation to gender and faculty careers appear in the listing of mean age at career events (Table 1). Although the average age of female chairs at the time of receiving a bachelor's degree is essentially the same as male chairs, each subsequent career event, except becoming chair, shows a higher mean age for female chairs. Conversely, female chairs, on the average, are significantly younger than their male counterparts when they become chair. The average time interval between achieving full professor and becoming chair is 6.91 years for male chairs. It is 1.19 years for female chairs.

Interestingly, the mean age at which females receive tenure (36 years) is not significantly different from men (35.11 years) even though women receive associate professor, on the average, at an age 2.63 years older than men. It is not likely that tenure is predominantly a function of age because age differences appeared among chairs in different discipline categories at the point of receiving tenure. What may be happening is that women are more likely to be chairs in disciplines that grant tenure with less time between assistant professor and tenure, or the number of years between assistant professor and tenure may be a function of gender.

Table 1
*Mean Age and Standard Deviation of Chairs for Each Career Event by Gender*

| Career Event | Gender | |
|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female |
| Bachelor's | 21.76 | 21.63 |
| SD | 1.80 | 2.67 |
| Master's | 24.89 | 26.04[e] |
| SD | 2.76 | 4.17 |
| Ph.D. | 29.12 | 32.00[b] |
| SD | 4.08 | 6.09 |
| Assi. Prof. | 29.54 | 31.81[c] |
| SD | 3.71 | 4.80 |
| Asso. Prof. | 34.41 | 37.04[b] |
| SD | 4.67 | 5.01 |
| Tenure | 35.11 | 36.00 |
| SD | 4.67 | 4.31 |
| Full Prof. | 39.64 | 43.19[b] |
| SD | 4.47 | 5.68 |
| Curr. Chair | 46.55 | 44.38[c] |
| SD | 6.55 | 5.64 |

*Note.* b = $p<.0001$, c = $p<.001$, d = $p<.01$, e = $p<.05$

Another difference in the pattern of career movement for men and women is that men, on average, have been full professor for a considerably longer time (6.91 years) than women (1.19 years) before becoming department chair. To some degree, the relatively short time interval between full professor and department chair for women is exacerbated by the fact that a much higher percentage of female chairs (44.2%) than male chairs (20.4%) were not full professors when they became chair. If all female chairs were followed until they became full professors, the average age of female chairs at the time they became full professor would be even higher than the statistic reported in this study.

The difficulty with these statistics is that female chairs have been surveyed, on average, at a different point in their careers. The *normative* career path of department chairs (assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, department chair) was not true for at least 20 percent of the men and 44 percent of the women. Because this is a survey of department chairs and not full professors, it is unclear from these data if the apparent age difference of male and female chairs at the time of becoming full professor is a reflection of differing career patterns or some other effect of working in higher education.

The more important practical difference is that women are more likely than men to become department chair before becoming full professor. Being department chair without being full professor causes problems that full professors might not have. Authority is limited with those of higher rank and the energies placed into obtaining full professor reduce time available for administering the department. This increased stress in the position, which appears to be more likely in female chairs, could affect administrative effectiveness and length of tenure as chair.

Bowker, Hinkle, and Worner (1983) may provide some explanation of why female faculty were younger when they became chair. Female faculty (especially married female faculty) express interest in administrative positions in higher numbers than males. Their interest in administrative service does not diminish as they increase in rank, as is the case for male faculty. In addition, female faculty who are interested in administrative positions aspire, in general, to higher administrative positions than male faculty. If they are to achieve those positions through hierarchical advancement, then they would have to begin their administrative careers early enough to progress through the necessary career stages. Since the position of department chair is the most common entry point into administrative career hierarchies (McDade, 1987), then female chairs might be expected, on the average, to be younger than male chairs. Bowker, Hinkle, and Worner (1983) do not attempt to show any correlation between interest in administrative positions and actually achieving them, although a relationship is likely to exist. To some degree this is borne out by this

study in that female chairs (11.5%) were more likely to have been an associate dean prior to their chair position, than male chairs (5.9%).

Regardless, less than 10 percent of chairs are female. Although this study was not designed to assess every department in the surveyed institutions, female chairs consistently appeared in a few disciplines. A more careful examination of these issues is necessary to discover if these differential patterns are driven by the pool of available chair candidates, socialization within disciplines, gender related stereotypes, or other forces from within departments.

**Discipline (Hard/Soft)**

The average number of years for all chairs, between bachelor's degree and department chair, is 24.6 years. But, not all chairs follow a similar timetable in moving from position to position within their faculty careers. The differences become most apparent in comparing hard discipline chairs to soft discipline chairs (Table 2). Biglan's (1973) hard/soft dichotomy is similar to Kuhn's (1970) description of levels of paradigm development within disciplines. Soft discipline chairs were older than hard discipline chairs at most career events. Soft discipline chairs, on average, have a significantly longer time between their master's degrees and doctorates (5.3 years) than hard discipline chairs (3.53 years). Consequently, every successive step also occurs at a later age for soft discipline chairs. The age difference between hard and soft discipline chairs diminishes at the time these chairs are tenured and statistically disappears at the point of becoming department chair.

Table 2
*Mean Age and Standard Deviation of Chairs for Each Career Event by Discipline Group*

| Career Event | Total | Hard | Soft |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bachelor's | 21.86 | 21.54 | 22.12[d] |
| SD | 2.12 | 1.65 | 2.45 |
| Masters | 24.87 | 24.90 | 25.26 |
| SD | 3.11 | 2.89 | 3.26 |
| PhD | 29.43 | 28.43 | 30.56[a] |
| SD | 4.88 | 4.26 | 4.46 |
| Assi. Prof. | 30.08 | 29.08 | 30.45[b] |
| SD | 3.89 | 3.11 | 4.39 |
| Asso. Prof. | 34.78 | 33.84 | 35.61[a] |
| SD | 4.37 | 3.73 | 4.73 |
| Tenure | 35.31 | 34.77 | 35.85[d] |
| SD | 4.81 | 4.34 | 5.17 |
| Full Prof. | 39.39 | 39.29 | 40.63[d] |
| SD | 4.66 | 4.19 | 5.03 |
| Curr. Chair | 46.28 | 46.11 | 46.76 |
| SD | 6.58 | 6.55 | 6.60 |

*Note.* a = $p<.00001$, b = $p<.0001$, c = $p<.001$, d = $p<.01$, e = $p<.05$

It is not possible to know from this study if this difference between ages of chairs at the doctorate degree is a function of behaviors of individuals within the disciplines (taking time off for other activities between degrees, or returning for doctorates after other professional experience) or if it is characteristic of the curricula within disciplines (combining masters and doctoral programs, or designed time periods for achieving a doctorate after a masters). Blackburn (1985) does highlight the period between masters and doctoral degrees as a time of *selection/attrition* (forces act to include or discourage students from continuing to professorate) and *sanctioning* (clues are provided to a student's potential success in the discipline). The variation of time between bachelor's and doctoral

degrees among disciplines may be an indication that the process of socialization into a discipline takes differing amounts of time.

The age differences among chairs are considerably diminished at the point of becoming department chair. For the sample, individuals became chair at a mean age of 46.43 years old. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents became chair between the ages of 40 and 52. The implication here is that progress from one faculty rank to another is closely tied to a somewhat universal timetable in higher education. Becoming department chair, on the other hand, may be more a function of chronological age.

In addition to information about themselves, chairs reported the length of time their two predecessors spent as chairs and their predecessors' career movements. Current chairs reported information on 1040 previous chairs: 548 first predecessors and 492 second predecessors. A comparison based on the hard/soft dichotomy shows hard discipline chairs having significantly longer tenures as chair (6.98 years) than their soft discipline counterparts (5.85 years, $p<.001$). Pfeffer and Moore (1980) recognized a similar relationship between discipline paradigm development and chair tenure to the one observed between the hard/soft dichotomy and chair tenure in this study.

Six career move destinations were presented from which chairs could select the movements of their predecessors: return to full time faculty status, a move to another chair position, continuing in another administrative capacity, moving out of academe, retirement, and other. For the entire sample, 64.74 percent of the chairs returned to faculty status on the first move from the chair position, while 18.66 percent continued in an administrative position (another chair or administration), 3.44 percent moved out of academe, 7.81 percent retired, and the remainder (4.83%) had died or reported a sabbatical or other short term move that could not be classified into one of the other categories.

Hard discipline chairs were less likely to return to full time faculty (59.93%) than soft chairs (70.60%). Similarly, hard chairs were more likely to continue as administrators (22.08%) than soft discipline chairs (15.24%).

On the average, 12.4 percent of the previous chairs moved to new institutions during their first move from the chair position. Hard discipline chairs (14.95%) were more likely to move than soft (9.7%). Four percent of the chairs moved to new chair positions. This group accounts for about one third of the individuals who moved to new institutions.

Chairs also indicated the system in which they were hired. The majority (58.85%) were hired in a faculty oriented system (rotational, elected by faculty, or elected by faculty with the approval of the dean) The remainder (40.96%) were hired in an administratively oriented system (appointed by the dean or higher administrator with or without the suggestions of the faculty). Hard disciplines had significantly fewer chairs selected in faculty oriented hiring systems (52.57%) than soft disciplines (65.17%).

**Career Paths**

Considerable variation exists among the careers of chairs both before they become chair and after they have served as department chair. Although no universal career paths for department chairs is suggested from this study, what does appear are generalizable tendencies of male/female and hard/soft dichotomous groups in terms of career behaviors.

Female chairs are younger than males on average when they become chair, are as likely as not to have attained full professor, are more likely than their male counterparts to have had previous administrative experience, and may show a greater propensity for further administrative work after the department chair position.

Department chairs in hard discipline departments are younger at most career events prior to becoming department chair than chairs in soft disciplines. Hard discipline chairs have longer tenures as chair than soft discipline chairs, and are more likely to have been selected in administratively oriented hiring systems. Hard discipline chairs are equally likely to return to faculty status or further administrative work after their tenure as chair, where soft discipline chairs most frequently return to faculty status. And, hard discipline

chairs are more likely to move to another institution after the department chair than soft discipline chairs.

Regardless of these patterns which do appear, it is not clear that there is any practical difference among the individuals in these various categories. The preponderance of chairs follow similar faculty career paths, become department chair, return to faculty, and then retire as faculty. Conversely , a large number of chairs have chosen different paths prior to becoming chair, remain chair for inordinately long or short periods, or do not return to faculty after their tenure as chair. The question which originated this study was whether there is anything about department chair careers which can assist in understanding the relationship of chairs to the larger institutions in which they function. Investigation of this question in relation to these conflicting data requires some analysis of the careers of department chairs in the light of what is known about careers in organizations in general.

## Identifying Department Chair as a Career Stage

Careers are defined partially as socially recognized patterns of sequential movement among jobs (Wilensky, 1961). Essentially, all chairs are faculty before they become chair. There is a normative faculty career path that includes achieving bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. Tenure is usually granted close to the time of achieving associate professor.

Faculty careers are sequential and time between advancements, to a great degree, is fixed. The pattern of career movement for faculty is known and accepted within academic institutions, and it has existed over a considerable time (Bowen & Schuster, 1986).

For the position of department chair, the position is not part of the normative career of faculty, and it does not necessarily occur at a fixed point in faculty careers. The vast majority of chairs return to faculty status, so the position is also not sequential.

When administrative careers in academic institutions are considered, the normative career path is faculty, department chair, dean, provost, and president (Cohen, & March,

1986). Although there is considerably more variation in administrative career movement than there is faculty career movement, the pattern of career movement for academic administrators is sequential, socially accepted, and has existed for some time.

Here too, the department chair does not fit well in a normative description. Twenty percent of those who become chair will pursue even one additional administrative position, and the rest will leave academe or return to faculty. In addition, large numbers of those who do become administrators in higher education are never department chairs.

Horizontal career moves are usually for the purpose of finding a more desirable or satisfying work setting (Becker, 1968). Because of the sense that *a desire for more satisfying work* comes close to the reasons that chairs have expressed for becoming chair in these studies, faculty who become chairs seem to be making horizontal career moves. But, considering the percentage of chairs who return to faculty, either they become disillusioned after they become chair or some other rationale for the career decision exists.

Becker (1968) suggests that career moves can also be an attempt to obtain greater power and prestige. Snyder, Howard, and Hammer (1978) report power and authority as a major motivation for faculty desiring to become department chair. In contradiction, faculty, and to some degree chairs themselves, consider the department chair position to be the least powerful position in academe—even less powerful than faculty (Hill & French, 1967).

Apparently, traditional career path models do not fit particularly well with the observed behavior of department chairs. Only in the most liberal sense of career as the interaction of the individual with the organization (Blankenship, 1977) can the position of department chair be modeled. Even in that sense, career becomes defined as the degree to which an individual performs within acceptable norms of the organization. This is not useful for identifying patterns of movement within the institution.

An alternative explanation for faculty making a career move to department chair is that it is not intended as career advancement. Whether individuals become chairs out of

obligation, altruism, fear, or need for a change, they do not become chairs as part of a socially recognized pattern of advancement in academic institutions. Both those who have become chairs and the institution fully intend for chairs to continue with the substance of their faculty assignment. The chair position is not viewed as necessarily being part of a sequence to advanced status within their careers.

The chair who continues in an administrative role after the chair position is the exception and not the rule. The chair is seen as a faculty member who, for a short period of time, serves the department and the institution in a managerial role.

### Socialization of Chairs

The socialization of faculty to their disciplines is a long process. Chairs, on the average, have 25 years of experience in their disciplines before they become department chairs. Advancement at every stage of their careers has been based on success within their disciplines . Reward and encouragement reflects being appreciated by those who act and think within the contexts of the discipline. As Blackburn (1985) points out, socialization continues throughout the careers of academic faculty, although socialization events tend to cluster around career advancement stages.

With this intensity of training in acceptable behaviors within disciplines, it is understandable chairs do not cease their faculty duties when they become chair. Equally, their return to faculty status after the department chair is logical in the knowledge of the strength of discipline socialization. Many department chairs never completely make the transition from their role as faculty to that of department chair (Seedorf, 1990). There are other professions with this same intensity of socialization. Like university faculty, lawyers and doctors also have long apprenticeships and established structures of socialization.

When the body of knowledge required to achieve professional status is large, the energy necessary to change professions is also large. It has been estimated that the average

American will make four career changes in his or her work life. Career changes are uncommon among doctors, lawyers, and, to a great degree, university professors.

Managers within these groups continue to practice within their professions. Although the hierarchical structure of doctor's and lawyer's professions is more obscured than university professors, managers in all these professions are generally senior members within the profession and attain or are granted positions of leadership based on implicit criteria which may or may not include seniority or professional expertise. These managers represent the members of their professions and are likely to return to professional status after their experience in a managerial role.

### A Case for Leadership in the Department Chair

The usual metaphor for the selection of chairs is department chairs emerging from the faculty. Like the springtime observations of wildflowers and dormant creatures emerging, there is a sense of a natural, undirected process at work. Leadership at the department level is handled by people who were not necessarily leaders in a previous role, without (for the most part) any previous managerial experience, and with little intention of continuing in a leadership role beyond a few years as department chair. The metaphor may, indeed, be accurate. The life cycle of chairs is emerging from the faculty, being active briefly in the leadership of the institution and department, and returning to the faculty in a more dormant leadership state.

Booth (1982) suggests that this may be necessary. Individuals who have not been socialized to institutional administrative orientations are necessary in the hierarchy of administration to temper and balance bureaucratic tendencies of the institutions. This seems naive, inefficient, and ineffective. Leadership does not *emerge* in individuals in a fully developed form. "Leadership development is a process that extends over many years" (Gardner, 1990, p. 171). It is difficult to imagine the *emergent* department chair providing leadership within the few years that is typical of his or her tenure.

More likely, institutions view department chairs as temporary managers. Individuals who maintain the department on a daily basis and serve as messengers between the administrative and technical cores of the institution (Bare, 1986; Leslie, 1973). Leadership is something quite different. "Leadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (Gardner, 1990, p. 1).

A number of factors work against the potential that leaders will occur in the position of the department chair. For the most part the goals of the followers (faculty) are established by the process of socialization within the discipline. These goals are based on individual performance and not usually a contribution to a group. This individual orientation places in question whether the faculty can or will be followers. In addition, encouraging specialization makes it unlikely that those who become chair can or will have the broader more generalized vision that is necessary in leadership.

Another of the inhibitions of the potential for leadership at the department level is that large bureaucracies discourage initiative and innovation. Consistently, leadership literature emphasizes focus on the renewal of organizational structure and process as one of the cornerstones of leadership. Large bureaucracies make renewal a formidable task.

Regardless of the restrictions to leadership academic institutions present, the ability to overcome those restrictions is, to some extent, a function of leadership training. Department chairs are not trained. Except in a few isolated programs, department chairs come to the job with little notion of its complexities or with skills necessary to deal with those complexities. Repeatedly, the chair position has been shown to be of primary importance to the effective functioning of the institution. Yet, no attention is paid to the development of management or leadership expertise at the department level. It appears that development of leadership skills throughout academic institutions, and especially at the department chair level, is a low priority.

Chairs are highly socialized to their disciplines and do not lose their discipline orientations when they become chairs. They remain champions of their faculties and their disciplines. It makes sense that skilled leaders would be more beneficial to departments and institutions than novices. Since those skills take time to develop, the interest and training in leadership must begin before individuals become chairs. Disciplines need to identify and encourage those who will be their potential leaders.

The study of the careers of department chairs shows chairs to be a temporary, untrained cadre of faculty in a tenuous and ambiguous position. The potential for more effective leadership at the department level exists, but it will require acknowledgement of the need for the development of departmental leaders by both academic institutions in general and each discipline specifically.

Institutions need to reward leadership in the same ways that other institutional productivity is rewarded. Within faculty careers, for those individuals who are interested, administrative and leadership activities need to be encouraged. As faculty are now identified who excel in instruction, research, or bringing knowledge into practice, so also should faculty who have developed management and leadership skills be acknowledged.

Leadership is not a natural by-product of the academic life. Individuals are leaders because of training and attention to developing leadership skills. The fact that so little attention is paid to leadership development within academe explains, to a great extent, why leadership is often difficult to identify in institutions of higher learning. In terms of the chair, if departments are to have dynamic and skilled *defenders of the faith*, then departments, and more broadly disciplines, must take on the responsibility of developing leadership within their ranks. Perhaps only then will the position of department chair appear as a normative step in careers in academe.

## References


Bare, A. (1986). Managerial behavior of college chairpersons and administrators. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(2), pp. 128-138.

Becker, H. S. (1968). The career of the school teacher. In B. G. Glaser (Ed.), *Organizational Careers* (pp. 381-387). Chicago: Aldine.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), pp. 195-203.

Blackburn, R. T. (1985). Faculty career development: Theory and practice. In S. M. Clark, & D. R. Lewis (Ed.), *Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity* (pp. 55-85). New York: Teachers College Press.

Blankenship, R. L. (1977). Organizational careers: An interactionist perspective. In R. L. Blankenship (Ed.), *Colleagues in Organization* (pp. 206-222). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Booth, D. B. (1982). *The department chair: Professional development and role conflict* . Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled* . New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowker, J. E., Hinkle, D. E., & Worner, W. M. (1983). Do women aspire to the same administrative positions as men? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 19*(2), pp. 64-81.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1987). *A classification of institutions of higher education* . Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Carroll, J. B. (in press). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education*

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* (2nd ed.). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Bean, J. P. (1981). Research output, socialization, and the Biglan model. *Research in Higher Education, 15*(1), pp. 69-91.

Creswell, J. W., & Roskens, R. W. (1981). The Biglan studies of differences among academic areas. *Research in Higher Education, 4*(Spring), pp. 1-16.

Creswell, J. W., Seagren, A., & Henry, T. C. (1979). Professional development training needs of department chairs: A test of the Biglan model. *Planning and Change, 10*(Spring), pp. 225-37.

Dressel, P. L., Johnson, F. C., & Marcus, P. M. (1970). *The confidence crisis* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership* . New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums* . Chicago: Aldine.

Heimler, C. H. (1967). The college departmental chairman. *Educational Record, 48*(2), pp. 158-163.

Hill, W. W., & French, W. L. (1967). Perceptions of the power of department chairmen by professors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11*(4), pp. 548-574.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leslie, D. W. (1973). The status of the department chairmanship in university organization. *AAUP Bulletin, Winter*, pp. 419-426.

McDade, S. A. (1987). *Higher education leadership: Enhancing skills through professional development programs* . Washington, D. C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 3*, pp. 243-259.

Moore, K. M., Salimbene, A. M., Marlier, J. D., & Bragg, S. M. (1983). The structure of presidents' and deans' careers. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(5), pp. 500-515.

Muffo, J. A., & Langston, I. W. (1981). Biglan's dimensions: Are the perceptions empirically based? *Research in Higher Education, 15*(2), pp. 141-159.

Roach, R. H. (1976). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities. *Educational Record, 57*, pp. 13-223.

Schein, E. H. (1977). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual scheme. In J. R. Hackman, E. E. L. III, & L. W. Porter (Ed.), *Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations* (pp. 138-152). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Seedorf, R. (1990). *Transition to leadership: The university department chair*. Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University.

Shtogren, J. A. (1978). A context for development activities for department chairpersons. In J. A. Shtogren (Ed.), *Administrative development in higher education* (pp. 171-180). Richmond, VA: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society.

Smart, J. C., & Elton, C. F. (1975). Goal orientations of academic departments: A test of the Biglan model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(5), pp. 580-588.

Smart, J. C., & Elton, C. F. (1976). Administrative roles of department chairmen. In J. C. Smart, & J. R. Montgomery (Ed.), *New directions for institutional research: Examining departmental management, No. 10* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Snyder, R. A., Howard, A., & Hammer, T. H. (1978). Mid-career change in academia: The decision to become an administrator. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 13*, pp. 229-241.

Tucker, A. (1984). *Chairing the academic department* (2nd ed.). New York: American Council on Education.

Twombly, S. B. (1986). *Career lines of top-level two-year college administrators: Implications for leadership in a new era.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, Texas. 20-23 February, 1986. ED 268 884.

Twombly, S. B. (1986). *Theoretical approaches to the study of career mobility: Applications to administrative career mobility in colleges and universities.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. 16-29 April, 1986. ED 271 548.

Wilensky, E. (1961). Orderly careers and social participation. *American Sociological Review, 26,* pp. 521-539.

Wilensky, E. (1968). Careers, life-styles, and social integration. In B. G. Glaser (Ed.), *Organizational Careers* (pp. 50-53). Chicago: Aldine.